LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

GOLD CRISIS

The Editor

★

RACIALISM NOW A PART OF BRITISH LAW

Lord Brockway

★

PEACE AND THE EASTER MARCH

Dick Nettleton

★

POWER AND THE UNIONS

John Ball

★

Government Cuts, Solly Kaye and Martin Jacques; Aden, the Gulf and Oil, Céline Whittleton; Whither Germany?, Gordon Schaffer; Jazz, Brian Blain; Cartoons by Scorpio

APRIL 1968

2s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY

Editor: R. Palme Dutt Associate Editor: R. Page Arnot
Managing Editor: Roger Woddis

VOL. 50 No. 4 APRIL . 1968

CONTENTS

Page

Notes of the Month: Gold Crisis. *'Domino' Theory of Capitalism —Gold Showdown—The Savage Belabours His Idol—Lenin Misquoted—Can Capitalism Do Without Gold?—Marx on Gold and Capitalism—What Determines the Value of Gold?—What is the £?—Illusions of Ultra-Imperialism—Cracking of the Dollar Offensive for World Domination—The Battle is Open* **R.P.D.** 145

Racialism Now a Part of British Law. Meaning of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act .. .. .. **Lord Brockway** 159

Peace and the Easter March. General Secretary of CND calls for massive demonstration against US war in Vietnam **Dick Nettleton** 160

Power and the Unions. Significant changes in the mood of the rank and file .. .. **John Ball** 162

The Arts Today. A Declaration of Intent, **Norma Cohen;** Jazz Today and Tomorrow, **Brian Blain** 166

Cartoons by Scorpio 168

Government Cuts: (1) **The Councils.** Attack on the social services **Solly Kaye** 172

(2) **Youth.** Hardships of young workers and students **Martin Jacques** 175

Aden, the Gulf and Oil. New reactionary alliance to maintain status quo .. .. **Céline Whittleton** 178

Whither Germany? How workers in the GDR have become 'Masters of Tomorrow' .. .. .. **Gordon Schaffer** 182

Collector's Item 185

Student Trouble at Cambridge in 1918. Revealing letter to Lord Curzon 186

A Way to Win New Readers 187

Forty Years Ago 187

Book Reviews: 'Reformation to Industrial Revolution', Christopher Hill: *Clemens Dutt*; 'William Morris', Philip Henderson: *Andrew Rothstein*; 'Heartbreak Housing', Frank Allaun: *Tom Vernon*; 'Money and Inflation', Emile Burns: *John Eaton* .. 188

Soviet Award for Jack Lindsay 191

Accent on Peace .. .. **Helen Falber** 192

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

GOLD CRISIS

> **'Capitalist production forever strives to overcome this metallic barrier, the material and phantastic barrier of wealth and its movements, in proportion as the credit system develops, but forever breaks its head on this same barrier.'**
>
> KARL MARX, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 674 (Chapter 35, Section 1, 'The Movements of the Gold Reserve').

March 18, 1968

These Notes were written before the announcement of the decision of the central bankers of the Gold Pool meeting in Washington (United States and six associates, with France absent). This decision solves nothing and will only intensify the crisis. The 'two-tier system', which is universally recognised as a temporary compromise doomed to fail, is equivalent to a de facto *devaluation of the dollar, while trying to keep up appearances. The soothing words that this is 'only a financial crisis' and will not affect the economy of the capitalist world ominously repeats the language of October 1929, with parallel blindness to world realities. The dollar has suffered a defeat and will ferociously fight back. The battle between the rival monopolist powers and blocs will sharpen, as every device is brought into play by each contestant to force up exports and restrict imports in a shrinking world market. The battle of the peoples everywhere—in Britain specifically against the Budget offensive due to be announced tomorrow and against the new legislation to throttle wages and curb the unions with penal sanctions—and of the underdeveloped countries, which will receive the sharpest edge in the offensive of the strongest monopolist powers to solve their crisis at the expense of the weakest, now reaches a new height.*

March 17, 1968

On March 14, the eighty-fifth anniversary of the death of Marx, world capitalism celebrated the occasion by staggering into a gold crisis, centred on the citadel of capitalism in the United States and its almighty dollar, shaking still further the already sickly sterling satellite, and rocking the economies of all the capitalist countries, with such a feverish intensity and break-neck acceleration as to arouse among its startled votaries nightmare visions of the possible onset of a new 1929-31. That night, on the bidding of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington, after midnight the Privy Council hastily met in London to close the banks and the Stock Exchange next day, as at the onset of major war. The central bankers, who had met four days previously at Basle on March 10 to issue a solemn declaration exorcising the crisis with as much effect as an elderly spinster spitting into a hurricane, travelled anew to meet in Washington in order to devise further measures. Where now are the loudly proclaimed marvels of the 'new' 'crisis-free' 'managed' capitalism? Once again the harsh test of practice is proving the basic truth of the Marxist economic analysis of the laws of capitalism, and mercilessly exploding the latest magic panaceas of the current Keynesian and post-Keynesian witch-doctors.

Blind Fury

Ferociously they blame De Gaulle and France, without seeing that this role is the expression of the battle, not the cause. Desperately they clamour to be freed from servitude to what they describe as the 'archaic superstition', or what Keynes described as the 'barbarous relic', of gold as the final arbiter, without realising that this fetishism of gold is inseparable from the functioning of developed commodity economy and capitalism. It is necessary to examine seriously the character and prospects of the present crisis, which is reinforcing the offensive already opened in Britain by devaluation, the cuts and the prospective Budget, and which will now, whatever the temporary interim plan or solution attempted, let loose the most pitiless offensive against all the peoples of every capitalist country in the world from the raging fury of capitalism in storm.

'Domino' Theory of Capitalism

In February Notes under the title of 'The New Crisis of Capitalism' we analysed the significance of sterling devaluation as likely to prove the starting point, beginning from the weakest link or 'Sick Man of Europe', of a major world crisis of capitalism which would centre on the United States. 'This is a developing crisis, not only of capitalism in Britain, but on a world scale, and not least in the United States.'

> Britain is now a diminished power on the world scale; but the crisis of sterling and devaluation in November could send tremors through all the countries of the capitalist world, bring the domination of the dollar into question, and lead to the aggressive counter-measures of President Johnson on January 1, which can in turn sharpen the developing battle and further aggravate the disequilibrium of the capitalist world.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A favourite theory of the apologists of the American war of aggression against the people of Vietnam—and it is a significant symptom of the close intertwining of economics and politics in the modern world situation that this Vietnam war is now universally recognised as a major factor in the present crisis of the dollar and of world capitalism—has always been to propound the so-called 'domino' theory in relation to South-East Asia and the world. Since the people of Vietnam, if allowed united free elections in accordance with the Geneva Agreements, would have chosen, according to President Eisenhower's statement, by a four-fifths majority a communist regime, it seemed essential to the American rulers to use every means of violent intervention to prevent this outcome, on the grounds that, if the Vietnam people were left free to choose communism, then so would the peoples of Laos and Cambodia, then Thailand, then Malaysia, then Burma, then India, and so on to the whole world in accordance with the Dulles's nightmare vision. The soothsayers of American imperialism might be wiser to apply their 'domino' theory to the pillars of capitalism and the effects of sterling devaluation.

Gold Showdown

In the Notes of December, 1966, under the title 'Deflation, Devaluation and Damnation', we anticipated that the present stage of the developing crisis of capitalism would not necessarily repeat the forms of 1929-31, since modern capitalism, through the further fulfilment of its laws of motion already laid bare by Marx and by Lenin in terms of the specific conditions of successive preceding periods, had reached to forms going beyond the concrete conditions of those preceding periods. On the basis of the concrete conditions of world capitalism in its present phase we offered the prediction that the next stage of its developing crisis would be likely to break out in the first place on the question of gold, the attempted replacement of gold by the dollar through the artificially imposed maintenance of a low price of gold, and the consequent prospective crash of this unstable system, which would lay bare all the contradictions and once again reveal the basic role of gold in the economy of capitalism:

> There is no more vivid expression of the general crisis of capitalism in the economic sphere than the collapse of the old pre-1914 gold standard—for the present 'gold exchange standard' is a very different system, manipulated by the most powerful finance-capitalist interests, dominantly American; thinly concealing the ceaseless battle, alongside co-operation, of the currencies of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rival imperialist blocs, of the dollar, sterling, the franc and the mark; and only revealing in the last analysis, when the chips are down, the ultimate basis still in gold as the final measure of value.

Unfortunately, all the current fashionable academic economists and financial commentators have been trained from their callow student days to turn a blind eye to the economic theories of Marxism as obviously old hat and long ago exploded, and have in consequence never taken the trouble to study these theories seriously at first hand and make the effort necessary to understand them. This is not to say that these theories provide any ready-made dogmatic formula to solve present problems, but only the elementary foundation for a scientific approach and method in order to throw light on the concrete new problems as they arise. Consequently, in view of the extraordinary confusion and incoherence handed out by these experts in dealing with the present situation, it becomes necessary to endeavour to explain as simply as possible some of the facts of life, which always at every sharp turn reduce these experts to a paroxysm of uncomprehending anger and bafflement.

The Savage Belabours His Idol

At the outset it is worth noting that these 'experts' invariably contradict one another according to which particular imperialism they are serving. Thus the current fashionable starting point of all the Anglo-American 'experts', angrily conducting their polemic against De Gaulle and the spokesmen of French imperialism, is to denounce gold as an obsolete superstition and barbarous relic which ought long ago to have been abandoned by all civilised people as a medium for economic transactions and only used for ornament or filling teeth. 'The Archaic Myth of Gold' was the three column heading of a *Times* editorial on November 28, 1967, which denounced gold as 'a most inadequate basis for the world's monetary system'. *The Times* declared that 'any rational basis for the world's monetary system' must not be 'at the mercy of the superstitions and accidents surrounding the gold supply', and looked forward to 'the total demonetisation of gold except in countries like India, the Arab sheikhdoms and France where its mystique might cling on for a few years as an archaic relic of a bygone era of economic history'. *The Observer* on January 8, 1967, devoted a whole page feature by its Business Editor under the title 'The Mad Magic of Gold', quoting with delight the dictum of Keynes: 'Dug up in South Africa, only to be buried in Fort Knox.' The American magazine *Time*, with its five million circulation, on January 15, 1968, denounced gold as 'a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basically inelastic and unsatisfactory medium of exchange', and called for 'a better system, in which men can have mastery over their monetary affairs'. Wonders will never cease. The hearts of the multi-millionaires yearn for utopia. As if it were not the essence of capitalism that men do not have mastery over their economic affairs, but commodities and markets have mastery over men.

Invoking Marx and Lenin

Eagerly these heroic crusaders of the Anglo-American multi-millionaires against the evils of gold (of course, not to be said aloud, in the interests of the dollar and sterling or a projected Anglo-American synthetic currency) seek to enrol Marx and Lenin in their army by quoting some of the merciless remarks of these leaders of socialism about the rôle of gold—but with no more understanding of the theoretical basis of the remarks they quote than an orang-utang would have of Einstein. With glee *The Guardian* leader-writer on November 24, 1967, quoted Marx's description of gold as 'a capitalist fetish', and chortled approval: 'This is precisely what it is'—without the slightest indication of any understanding of the technical use of the term 'fetish' and the 'fetishism of commodities' in Marxist theory to describe the essential character of the system of capitalism, in which the social relations of men in production are disguised as relations of things or commodities, and in place of men having control of their economic relations (socialism) their economic relations have control of men ('fetishism' of capitalism).

Lenin Misquoted

Similarly Lenin's famous satirical remark is endlessly quoted by these scribes, suggesting the future use of gold for public lavatories. But by triumphantly citing this remark as ammunition for their offensive against the present use of gold as a measure of value and medium of circulation, they only reveal their ignorance of the context. Lenin's remark was made in the course of an article published in November 1921, that is, during the period of Nep or partial restoration of commodity relations; and its full title was 'The Importance of Gold Now and After the Complete Victory of Socialism'. Note well, '*Importance*'. His contemptuous suggestion for its future use was explicitly made only for the situation *after* the complete ending of capitalism and victory of socialism, not only in the Soviet Union, but throughout the world:

> When we are victorious on a world scale I think we shall use gold for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose of building public lavatories in the streets of some of the largest cities of the world.*

But for the present situation the whole purpose of his article was to emphasise the *importance* of gold:

> But however 'just', useful or humane it would be to utilise gold for this purpose, we nevertheless say: let us work for another decade or two with the same intensity and with the same success as in the 1917-21 period, only in a much wider field, in order to reach this stage. Meanwhile, we must save gold in the RSFSR, sell it at the highest price, buy goods with it at the lowest price. 'When you live among wolves, you must howl like a wolf.'

So long as commodity relations and capitalism remain, the indispensable function of gold continues.

Can Capitalism Do without Gold?

The Chairman of the US Federal Reserve Board, Mr. W. McChesney Martin, said in a speech in London in 1967 (*The Times*, 17.8.67):

> The price of gold . . . need no more move with the commodity price level than any other standard or unit of measure needs to move over time just because the objects to be measured get larger.

Herein is exposed with classic clarity the fundamental fallacy of the capitalist ideological or idealist approach on the question of gold, which underlies the present crisis. Gold is assumed to have been fixed as a measure of value, and its price accordingly laid down at any arbitrary level thought fit for the purpose of measuring the value or price of commodities, not because it is itself a commodity with its own value and price, but as a kind of conscious social contract or royal edict or government decision—like laying down the metre or yard as a measure of length. This completely unhistorical approach derives from the fact that the US Government in 1934 tried to fix the price of gold at $35 an ounce for all eternity, and through the International Monetary Fund after the second world war to impose this on all the currencies of the world—which is the immediate source of the present troubles. Hence the dream expounded in all the columns of the financial and general press today to 'release' world currency and exchange from being tied to the 'barbarous' metallic basis of gold, and establish some kind of new ideal super-national

* As often, the millionaires have already adopted for themselves in advance Lenin's suggestion for the future communist society:

BATHROOMS ON THE GOLD STANDARD

An aircraft load of the newest status symbols was flown from Newcastle to Paris today. Instead of cars and wide-screen television sets, smart sets are buying plug holes, bathroom taps and toilet fittings—in 24-carat gold (*The Times*, 16.9.61).

[However, it is always possible that these 'smart sets' are not so much concerned with a new luxury as to acquire some durable value in place of depreciating paper.]

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

currency which would float without material basis by the will of governments:

> The world needs to get away from any particular fetish metal whose character and availability is beyond rational control towards more suitable tailor-made instruments whose volume and use can be regulated intelligently (*The Times*, 17.8.67).
>
> A start ought to be made on 'phasing gold out' of the international payments set-up (*Financial Times*, 7.3.68).

This is the dream which has been ceaselessly floated by all the capitalist economic and financial experts and theorists since Keynes, and which has no less repeatedly, as today, stubbed its toe against the material basis of gold.

Fallacy of Comparisons With the Metre or Yard

Gold, argues the sage Mr. McChesney Martin, authorised senior voice of US finance-capital, ought no more to vary in price with changes in the commodity price level than 'any other standard or unit of measure', like the metre or the yard, needs to vary in length because the things to be measured grow longer. In this comparison is exposed the whole bankruptcy of modern post-classical bourgeois economic theory, which, after abandoning the serious classical method that was carried forward and brought to theoretical clarity by Marx, lives henceforth in respect of general theory in subjective idealist clouds, but in practice wisely confines itself to empirical market calculations. The fallacy of comparing the function of gold as a measure of value to the metre or the yard is that the metre and the yard are entirely arbitrary units laid down by a specific governmental decision. The metre was established in 1801, as part of the innovations arising from the French revolution, by the French Government to represent the distance at 0 degrees centigrade between the centres of two lines engraved on a bar of platinum-iridium in Paris. The yard was originally laid down in England, and was supposed to have represented the length of the arm of King Henry I, was established by the statute of Edward I in 1305, was embodied in a bronze bar in the eighteenth century, which was legalised in 1824, then lost in 1834, and replaced by the present highly elaborate construction of gunmetal with gold studs in well-holes maintained under uniform temperature and pressure. Thus even the metre and yard require a material basis, and are consequently confronted with all the problems of defying the corroding effects of time. Gold, on the other hand, developed historically as a measure of value, initially among a variety of alternative less convenient commodities as a measure of value, not

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by any governmental decision imposing it, but precisely because it was itself a commodity, with its own value, independent of governments. The attempt to impose by governmental decree an arbitrary permanent price of gold, irrespective of its value, has been the immediate factor leading to the present explosion.

Marx on Gold and Capitalism

'Gold,' said Marx in his profound and basic treatment, whose study might have saved present-day official economists and financiers many headaches, 'is now money with reference to all other commodities only because it was previously, with reference to them, itself a commodity' (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 40). In principle any other commodity might have been similarly used, if generally acceptable, to serve as the universal equivalent or money; and many most varied commodities have been so used in different times and places; but for the reasons familiar in every elementary economic textbook gold became established, sometimes with silver as an auxiliary, as the most convenient commodity for this purpose, in view of its qualities of durability, relative lightness for transport, easy division, etc. On this basis a whole mountain of paper and credit could be built up, amounting to many times the actual basis in gold, to facilitate internal commercial transactions and also international trade—in the latter case with gold as the final means of settlement. But however astronomical the pyramid constructed on this basis, the final basis has had to remain the universally recognised commodity with a value of its own, independent of governments: gold. Whenever a storm arises in the capitalist structure the final basis reasserts itself.

> Credit in its capacity as a social form of wealth crowds money out and usurps its place. It is the faith in the social character of production which gives to the money-form of products the aspect of something disappearing and ideal. But as soon as credit is shaken—and this phase always appears of necessity in the cycles of modern industry—all the real wealth is to be actually and suddenly transformed into money, into gold and silver, a crazy demand, which, however, necessarily grows out of the system itself. And all the gold and silver, which is supposed to satisfy these enormous demands, amounts to a few millions in the cellars of the Bank.
>
> In the effect of the gold drains, then, the fact that production as a social process is not subject to social control is strikingly emphasised.
>
> (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. III, p. 673)

This analysis of the process in the classic era of nineteenth century capitalism has reached to a new height today, with the attempt to replace gold for domestic purposes by irredeemable paper money, resting on government fiat and ceaselessly shrinking in purchasing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, and for international transactions by the attempt to enforce acceptance of the dollar as the parallel partner of gold.

What Determines the Value of Gold?

Since gold, to serve as money or the universal equivalent, needs itself to be a commodity, the value of gold is necessarily determined in the same way as the value of every commodity, that is, by the average socially necessary labour for its production, in this case, for its extraction. Hence arises the peculiar dilemma of the present phase, when the attempt has been made by government action to hold down the price of gold for thirty-four years, since Roosevelt raised it in 1934, to a fixed permanent figure in terms of dollars, without regard to changes in value, at the same time as the modern official post-Keynesian economic policy of the same governments during these years has been to promote permanent gradual inflation as the supposed magic panacea for prosperity. Thus the price of all other commodities has in general trebled during this period; but the price of gold has been artificially pegged down to the same level. Then, as the disproportion has grown every year more glaring, the clamour has become ever more shrill about 'shortage of liquidity' and a demand for an alternative to gold. 'On a purely economic assessment,' admitted the *Financial Times* on March 16, 'the most sensible step which can be taken now is a sharp increase in the price of gold'. But this, the editorial continued, 'would benefit the major producers—Russia and South Africa—which the US is particularly anxious to prevent'. In practice, however, this dilemma cuts them both ways. If they increase the price, as they may possibly have to do, initially, as is widely suggested, under the cover of the 'two-tier system', it would inevitably strengthen the main socialist power, as well as the main gold-producing representative of the 'free world', South Africa. On the other hand, if they try to keep it pegged down, the price would eventually fall below value, so that it would become unprofitable in the capitalist world to mine it, and the Soviet Union would become the sole gold producer in the world. This is only one of the characteristic dilemmas which are battering at the unhappy heads of the central bankers meeting at this moment of writing in Washington.

Marx on Paper Money

Although Marx wrote before 1914 and the general crisis of capitalism had banished gold from domestic circulation in Britain, and eventually in all the developed capitalist countries, and confined

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gold to the settlement of international transactions, theoretical backing of currency or the illegal hoarding by desperate citizens struggling to escape from continuous robbery through irredeemable continuously depreciating paper as the only permitted form of cash, Marx dealt also with this question of 'inconvertible paper money issued by the State and having compulsory circulation' (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 102). He showed that while 'it has its immediate origin in the metallic currency', the 'law peculiar to the circulation of paper-money can spring up only from the proportion in which that paper-money represents gold', i.e. 'the issue of paper-money must not exceed in amount the gold (or silver as the case may be) which would actually circulate if not replaced by symbols'. To the extent that it exceeds this limit, the paper-money merely depreciates in value: 'if the quantity of paper-money issued be double what it ought to be, then, as a matter of fact, £1 would be the money-name not of $\frac{1}{4}$ of an ounce, but of $\frac{1}{8}$ of an ounce of gold.' But—and this is the decisive point—this issue of irredeemable paper-money by a State, which can thus multiply the quantity issued at its whim, but only thereby depreciate its value, can only be effective over the area where the legal authority of that given State runs:

> This compulsory action of the State can take effect only within that inner sphere of circulation which is co-terminous with the territories of the community.

Beyond those boundaries only gold value rules; the varying rates of exchange between the different paper currencies are calculated in fact on the basis of their relationship to gold, even though the gold never figures in the particular transaction.

What is the £?

The fantastic situation to which this process has reached in the modern period of the general crisis of capitalism, when every government issues unredeemable paper currency to whatever constantly increasing amount it thinks fit, without being limited any longer by the previous automatic constraint of the objective regulator of a gold basis, so that it can practise the modern technique of continuous inflation (the best way, as Keynes used to say, of reducing real wages without a direct clash), is illustrated by the pronouncement of the original signatory of the paper pound note, Lord Bradbury, on the weighty problem of what now is a pound. The name of Lord Bradbury was so universally familiar to all as the signature on each paper pound note that a paper pound came to be called 'a Bradbury'. His judg-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment may accordingly be regarded as authoritative. He wrote in a letter to *The Times* on July 11, 1945:

> Since 1931 I have often been asked the question: 'What is a pound sterling?' Finding my inability to answer it rather humiliating, I have addressed the same question to almost everyone I have met who I thought might know. The best reply that I have been able to get is that it is a promise by the Chief Cashier of the Bank of England to pay at some date which Parliament may hereafter determine whatever Parliament in its wisdom may direct him to pay. This is no doubt satisfactory enough, so far as it goes, but it does not go very far.

The problem 'What is a £?' has become as baffling to the bankers of Britain as the problem 'What is a Jew?' to the High Courts of Israel.

Dreams of a New 'World Currency' Divorced From Gold

This inevitable limitation of the effectiveness of an unredeemable paper currency to the territories of the state which issues it, and its final valuation in terms of gold when it comes to international transactions (disguised during the present phase in terms of the dollar, but with the dollar valuation fixed in terms of gold), is the fatal flaw in all the dreams, originally propounded by Keynes at the Bretton Woods Conference twenty-four years ago, and now propagated with endless repetition in an identical chorus by all the Anglo-American financial organs and spokesmen, for the establishment of an ideal 'world currency', freed from the base necessity of a primitive basis in gold, or from any material basis, and so 'tailor-made' (in the words of *The Times* extract quoted earlier) to be 'regulated intelligently' to meet 'world needs'. The fulfilment of these dreams assumes the existence of a world state, which could then issue and enforce acceptance of its irredeemable paper currency. But there is no world state. There is not even a 'world state' of the existing already limited capitalist world. There is only the jungle of the rival monopolist powers. Their attempts at co-operation, either for common class aims, or to establish for convenience some order in the basic disorder generated by their competition, are invariably rent by contradictions. When the dollar attempted to establish its world domination since the second world war, with Britain and sterling as a subservient satellite, the resistance of French imperialism is defeating that attempt. Similarly the latest attempt to establish the 'special drawing rights' from the International Monetary Fund as a pale substitute for the elusive *fata Morgana* of a 'world currency' is notoriously precarious, still awaiting ratification, and dependent on the shifting relationships and battle over voting rights in the control of the IMF.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Illusions of Ultra-Imperialism

It is true, as Lenin showed, that in theory the logic of imperialism, with its ceaseless concentration, merging into larger and larger units, and devouring of the weaker by the stronger, would finally lead to 'ultra-imperialism' or a single world trust, which could then issue a single world currency. But, as Lenin equally showed, the actual contradictions and battles arising in the path of this development, the economic and political conflicts, wars, class struggles, revolutions and national liberation struggles, are so violent and ceaselessly intensifying in scale and character that imperialism will in practice have been destroyed by the peoples whom it oppresses before it reaches its logical goal of ultra-imperialism. The truth of this analysis has been demonstrated by all the events of the whole modern era of the general crisis of capitalism. And it was not least shown, in the context of this question of gold and a 'world currency', by the proceedings and outcome of the original Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 which set up the International Monetary Fund and launched what has been described as the modern 'international monetary system'. Keynes, who inspired much of the general lines of the Treaty and the plan for the establishment of the IMF, put forward at the same time his plan for an international currency or 'bancor' under the auspices and control of the IMF. But here he was defeated by the United States delegation. The United States insisted and successfully secured that the dollar should be officially inscribed in the Treaty as equivalent to gold at the price determined by the US Government, and should become the measure for all other currencies. The Keynesian dreams of a visionary ultra-imperialist 'world currency' were defeated by the reality of US imperialism and its aims to establish dollar domination of the world.

Dollar Offensive for World Domination

The key clause which established this aim of US dollar world domination and inserted it in the Bretton Woods Treaty was in Article IV:

> The par value of the currency of each member shall be expressed in terms of gold as a common denominator or in terms of the United States dollar of the weight and fineness in effect on July 1, 1944.

This meant that the dollar was enshrined in the Treaty as an international currency equal to gold. In place of the former 'gold reserves' the participating states now kept 'gold and dollar reserves'. Not only that, but the price of gold was written into the treaty in terms of the dollar, and at a fixed unchangeable rate perpetuating the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figure of $35 an ounce originally laid down by Roosevelt in 1934, although the general level of prices had increased all round since then. This ensured that, the more prices rose, the more the gold stock at that artificially pegged low price would be found insufficient as a basis for international currency requirements, and the more all the participating states would find themselves compelled to be dependent on the dollar as the main basis for their currency ('gold and dollar reserves') and for international transactions. This technique was ideally calculated to bring the economy of all the capitalist states increasingly into the grip of the dollar. It was a technique for the dollar penetration of the economy of every non-socialist country, parallel to the political strategy of the State Department, with its proliferation of entangling treaties over every region of the capitalist world, and the military strategy of the Pentagon, which has now extended over one and a half million armed soldiers, sailors and airmen all over the globe outside the United States. The more the United States, with sterling as a subservient satellite, piled up deficits, the greater the penetration into the economy of the satellite countries.

Cracking of the Dollar Offensive for World Domination

The present gold crisis means that this dollar offensive for world domination has now begun to crack. The resistance in this recent period has been led by France. Hence the peculiar venom of every reference nowadays by the American press and the satellite British press to De Gaulle and France. The heavy deficits caused by the simultaneous wildly ambitious expansionist financial and capital exports strategy and parallel overseas military adventures, stationing of troops and rising expenditure, primarily of American imperialism, but at an even more costly rate in relation to its more slender economic and manpower resources of the weaker British imperialism, has brought an intolerable strain on the whole structure and made its stability increasingly precarious. Sterling was the first to crack. But the fall of sterling inevitably brought into question the unstable position of the dollar, with the astronomically rising costs of the Vietnam war, military expenditure now approaching the highest levels of the second world war, vast paper plans for domestic social expenditure to buy off the revolt of the most oppressed sections of the home population, and simultaneous resistance of Congress to voting the increases in taxation proposed. Once the queries were aroused, the rush to take refuge in gold from sterling and the dollar

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

became an avalanche. All the gold in Fort Knox could not meet the accumulated dollar liabilities. The London gold market was closed on orders from Washington. Whatever the outcome of the meeting of the central bankers now, at the moment of writing, taking place in Washington, it is evident that the artificial pegged low price of gold in terms of the dollar—the key to the strategy of the dollar offensive for world domination—can no longer be maintained, however ingenious the face-saving attempts that may be made to put a decent ceremonial cover over its burial. Devaluation of the dollar draws in view.

The Battle is Open

What is the prospect arising from this situation? There is no room for illusions. The battle of the monsters of the capitalist jungle is open. If the dollar is devalued, with the consequent effect on all other currencies, the supposed 'advantages' of sterling devaluation are swallowed up. Every monopoly outfit fights for its own hand, and the technical methods of state action in the present era of state monopoly capitalism are limitless. Every type of export subsidy and import restriction will be brought into play in the battle for the market. But the main offensive of each monopoly capitalism will be directed against its own workers ('Back Britain!' 'Back France!' 'Back the German Federal Republic!' 'Back the United States!' 'Accept sacrifices to meet the desperate economic situation!'), and against the most heavily oppressed and exploited sections of all, the peoples suffering from the colonial economy of the underdeveloped countries, who have already been most heavily hit during these recent years by the operations of the advanced monopoly capitalist powers (the Indian people have had to suffer a ruinous one-third devaluation imposed by American orders). Only the peoples of the socialist world, whose problems are always only problems of growth, will be able to continue to go forward, as they did in 1929-32, in face of the economic blizzard of the capitalist world. For the rest of us who still have to suffer for not having yet ended the capitalist social order the watchword needs to be unity to fight the offensive which capitalism has let loose in order to solve its crisis at the expense of the working people. In Britain this offensive makes itself felt by all, with the Budget, devaluation and the cuts programme, the wages policy to cut real wages, and legislation directed against the unions. The battle is open.

R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RACIALISM NOW A PART OF BRITISH LAW

Lord Brockway

MEMBERS of this Government have attempted to argue that the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1968 is not racialist. I do not charge Members of the Government with being racialist, but I don't know how it can be said that the Act is not racialist in purpose, content and effect.

The object of the Act is to exclude from Britain Asians in East Africa who did not become citizens of Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania when those nations became independent. I was in these territories at the time of independence and supported the appeals of Pandit Nehru, the Aga Khan and Indira Gandhi to the Indian communities to register as citizens. I found, however, that a number of Asians decided not to become Kenyans, Ugandans and Tanzanians because the British Government promised that those who did not do so would still be regarded as citizens of the United Kingdom and the Colonies. As such, they would have the right to British passports and of entry to Britain.

It is this promise which the new Act betrays; but the Government was faced with one difficulty. There is also a white British community in East Africa. How could they be admitted if the Asians were to be excluded? The Act saves them by provisions which whilst not describing them as white, lays down conditions of exemption which, in ninety-nine cases in a hundred, can apply only to whites.

A person will not be excluded from Britain if 'he, or at least one of his parents or grandparents, (a) was born in the United Kingdom, or (b) is or was a person naturalised in the United Kingdom or (c) became a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies by virtue of being adopted in the United Kingdom, or (d) became such a citizen by being registered under Part II of the British Nationality Act 1948 or under the British Nationality Act 1964'.

It would be very difficult to find a white Britisher in East Africa who is not covered by these exemptions. It would be very difficult to find an Asian who is covered by these exemptions. The Act is therefore in content racialist. It is hypocritical to pretend otherwise.

Britain now has a law which is clearly racialist in purpose, content, and effect. The first drops of the poison of *apartheid* have passed our lips.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PEACE AND THE EASTER MARCH

Dick Nettleton
General Secretary, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

IN 1967, the TUC, the Labour Party, the United Nations Association, the Liberal Party and the British Council of Churches have gone on record against the Government's support for America in Vietnam, reflecting a groundswell of opinion that finds expression every time the peace movement, especially at local level, engages in public activity. Anyone collecting signatures for a petition, blood or money for medical aid for Vietnam, or any similar activity, can testify to the concern that is shown and the response received. Shortly after the TUC, a public opinion poll, conducted by Gallup, showed a 61 per cent response to a question suggesting that Britain should be 'neutral' in the Vietnam conflict. The peace movement is still divided as to where to place the emphasis in its argumentation on Vietnam, veering from a purely humanitarian reaction to the horror and suffering, to a sophisticated analysis of the nature of the war, and its relationship to the struggle for national liberation in formerly backward territories.

The key unifying demand is that which calls for British dissociation from American policy. Some militants weight their arguments with a condemnation of the brutal and aggressive nature of the American attack on Vietnam, and the need for solidarity actions, both in word and deed, with the Vietnamese. This is correct, and is important in showing the Americans that world opinion is against them; but we must avoid the trap of letting our own Government 'off the hook'. The most effective thing that the British people can do is to mount such a campaign that Wilson is forced to move away from his position of complete public connivance at American policy and action. Dissociation by Britain would take away the myth, upon which Johnson and Westmoreland lean so heavily, that America is acting in Vietnam 'on behalf of the free world'. It would encourage the American peace movement, and it would be welcomed by the people of Vietnam. It would effectively contribute to peace in Vietnam. It would transform the position in Britain, because, for the first time since the 'forties, a British Government would be acting upon the wishes of its own people on a major foreign policy question, and not being pushed around by Washington.

British dissociation is a practical and realisable demand, the fulfil-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment of which would correspond to the interests of the British people, and would mark a decisive step towards the establishment of an independent and new foreign policy. This is why CND will ensure that this slogan is prominent in this year's Easter March and Easter Monday, when there is always the largest participation, will be devoted to the theme of peace in Vietnam.

For the first time since 1963, the march will be starting from Aldermaston. In 1964, when we moved away from Aldermaston, we were in the period leading up to the 1964 General Election, when Labour gained office. Whatever ambiguities there may have been about Labour's programme and prospects, one thing appeared to be clear. One issue sharply divided the two major parties. The Tories were firmly wedded to the idea of a British Bomb; 'our nuclear arm' Sir Alec Douglas Home used to call it, almost with affection. Labour was firmly opposed to the British Bomb; 'the Moss Bros. deterrent' was Wilson's way of dismissing it.

Wilson won the argument and the votes, and proceeded to make the British Bomb. At first there was a show of reluctance, the programme of five Polaris nuclear loaded submarines was reduced to four; and a picture was presented of a Government, against its better nature, carrying through a policy it had inherited from its predecessor which had already advanced it 'beyond the point of no return'. (Wilson used this phrase in that context in a letter to me in 1966.) As with previous attempts by Britain to acquire up-to-date nuclear weapons, the credibility of Polaris began to flounder. The development of an ABM system by the Russians called for an up-dating of the Polaris missile. In early 1967 Wilson was asked in the House, if Britain intended to refit with Poseiden missiles, the American attempt to counter the ABM system. He gave a clear and decisive answer (itself enough to arouse suspicion!). His answer consisted of the single word 'No'. It did not fit. Wilson's answer meant that Britain was committed to producing a fleet of submarines which would be obsolete by the time they were completed in 1970.

Now we know the answer. We do not need the American hardware, because we have developed our own warheads at Aldermaston and Farnborough. A new football-sized H-bomb which Chapman Pincher, Defence Correspondent of the *Daily Express*, described as 'a miracle of miniaturisation'. Instead of 64 H-bombs our Polaris fleet will be able to carry over 200, with a greater possibility of penetrating the Russian defence system.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

So, in 1964, when we thought that Aldermaston was to be run down as a nuclear weapons research establishment, and was no longer valid as a focal point for CND's demand for unilateral nuclear disarmament, we were wrong. Those who thought that, in British terms, the Bomb was a dead issue were wrong.

In March 1968, the last of Britain's Polaris fleet will be launched from Birkenhead. By 1970, Britain will possess the 'independent nuclear deterrent', that Sir Alec advocated in 1964. Come Good Friday, CND will be back at Aldermaston, to start a four-day march to London, ten years after the first Aldermaston March. In ten years the stockpiles of H-bombs have grown, China and France have come to possess them, other nations stand on the brink of nuclear capability, total annihilation is still only four minutes away, and Britain is still engaged in the lunacy of the nuclear arms race.

We will be marching for peace in Vietnam, against Polaris and Nato, for a new foreign policy . . . and for survival.

We invite you to join us. There are no bans or proscriptions. If you cannot march all the way, march for some of it. If you cannot march at all, give us your moral support, get messages of support, send donations and get others to do the same.

Let Aldermaston, 1968, mark the end of the cynicism of the last few years and the start of a new upsurge for peace and a decent world.

POWER AND THE UNIONS

John Ball

THE trade unions came close last month at Croydon to throwing out the first annual Economic Review produced by the Trades Union Congress general council, on which to base its pay-restraint vetting procedures until July 1969. The vote—4,620,000 in favour, 4,084,000 against—gave the general council a technical majority of 536,000 and a moral defeat. But it was the Government which suffered the heaviest rebuff, both in the vote and the debate at the Conference of Executives, for though the general council's policy was put forward as a trade union product, it was seen as part and parcel of a Government-inspired attempt to continue holding down pay rises. With Britain's two largest unions—the transport workers and the engineers—leading the 'Noes', the trade union movement has experienced the first occasion since the war when these two major unions have, together, shown leadership to Britain's 8 million

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organised trade unionists. From this arises, in a new form, the question of trade union power under today's circumstances and those of the future.

At heart, the continuing discussion on incomes policy in the trade union movement concerns the extent and the use of its power —both industrially and politically. The Government, by its ever-greater involvement in pay negotiation, has succeeded in focussing attention on the political role of the unions; by making normal pay claims into political acts, it has called forth a political response. The whole issue, it is true, has been clouded by the very presence of a Labour Government, and by the use its ministers and the right wing in the unions have made of the traditional union loyalties to the party they sired. But far from solving anything, moves of this kind (à la Carron and Cannon) have served only to sharpen the situation. Loyalty to a Government aimed at solving economic problems in the interests of the people is one thing—but loyalty to a Government attacking the unions on behalf of the employers has proved untenable.

So, from the partial hopes of 1964, through the confusion of the intervening years, the issue of trade union power has been thrown to the fore. Two main trends have crystallised.

On the one hand, there is the approach of the TUC general council majority, personified in the wages sphere by general secretary George Woodcock, that power for the unions consists in being consulted at each step by the Government. They must walk, in other words, down the 'corridors of power'. The corridors have in fact echoed ceaselessly to the tramp of trade union feet during the past three and a half years; consultations (if that is really the right word) have continued until Mr. Woodcock has been moved to quote King John, that life is:

> 'tedious as a twice-told tale,
> Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man'.

And what he describes as the 'shabby, shoddy compromises' have continued. But to what effect? A succession of White Papers spelling out pay freeze and restraint, and Prices and Incomes Acts interfering with the traditional right of the unions to bargain collectively with the employers. At this point in time we are promised more of the same kind. At the same time, there have been moves to devalue the role of the annual Trades Union Congress itself, in favour of the Conference of Union Executives, a move which excludes original motions from the individual unions in favour of a 'back-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

room' document to be swallowed whole or rejected whole by the movement. One significance of the vote at Croydon was that it indicated sharply that this method might not serve the right wing well as a measure of stunting left wing initiatives.

Fortunately the issue of trade union power has arisen also in a very different way from that set in motion by the right wing. Significant changes in the mood of the rank-and-file have expressed themselves in the election to office of men of a new mould than many hitherto, which in turn is helping create more responsive leaders. In the Amalgamated Engineering Union, where a powerful reaction grew against the 'Carron's Law' type of leadership, Hugh Scanlon has been elected to the Presidential office. His election was followed quickly by that of Ken Brett to an Assistant General Secretaryship (defeating the entrenched right-wing contender William Cockin). The elections for the executive of the National Union of Seamen saw an important group of left wingers elected—and since then two members of the executive have joined the Communist Party. And there have been other measuring rods of the new mood in the unions. Compare, for example, the leadership and policies of the Transport and General Workers' Union with those of the past few decades. Its handling of the dockers' strike in Liverpool, for example, was a blue-print for any union, recognising—as Jack Jones declared—that leadership does not consist of turning on your own membership and condemning men who are taking a stand for better pay and conditions. An urgent need is to strengthen the base of present left-wing leaders, and the unions themselves, by electing more left candidates. There is also the need for greater co-operation between the left in the unions and in Parliament, to strengthen the movement against anti-union laws and like measures.

The extent of the changes in the movement was made clear at the Croydon conference on February 28 (which itself followed last year's progressive decisions at the TUC) with the new phenomenon of Britain's two largest unions voting together against TUC pay restraint policy. It marked a new stage in the battle of the unions against government coercion.

Coming out of a long period of dominantly right-wing union leadership, the issue of trade union power has to be looked at afresh. The past two decades have been notable for the absence of cohesive drives or campaigns designed to take the membership forward on specific or general issues. There have been hard-fought battles—such as during previous pay freezes or at the time of German

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rearmament. But there have been few instances where major unions have linked forces to mount a campaign to break new ground. For many years equal pay has been pressed through the TUC, but has produced little in 20 years of pressure. Recently the five technicians' unions have jointly attacked the successive stages of the Government's incomes policy—but again, though strengthening the fight against pay restraint and state interference in collective bargaining, their campaign was essentially defensive. On its own initiative, the T & GWU launched the idea of a national minimum wage of £15 a week, which indicates the type of idea which can be the subject of multi-union pressure.

Power wielded by the unions will reflect the power position inside the unions. The effect of right-wing control—holding back the very concept of the unions as a power in their own right, able to give a real lead to the working population—will only finally be broken when the left-wing forces are powerful enough to generate new policies, together with the confidence and the motive force to make them a reality.

What form the power of the unions takes at any given time (how 'industrial' or 'political' it might be) depends on the issues involved and on the character and position of the Government of the day. It is true that wages and allied issues form the main bread and butter of the movement's activities, and joint action in one form or another is most likely around these. But there are many other spheres where a planned trade union approach could have beneficial results—for example, in the social and consumer sphere, and in the direct political sphere on issues such as laws governing sackings, etc. The point is not to set in train a series of ill-co-ordinated measures, but campaigns based on minimum demands able to secure the greatest possible unity and therefore strength throughout the movement.

From the Government (and, need it be said, from the employers') side of the fence, there will be no let up. The promised legislation, now being prepared, will present a further challenge to the unions, and with the report of the Royal Commission on Trade Unions due out soon, there are likely to be other avenues opened up for State intervention in the traditional bargaining and other union processes. With its immense resources, the trade union movement should not leave itself in the position of waiting on events. Attack is the only real form of defence, especially when the attack on the people comes in so many ways and on so many fronts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARTS TODAY

Edited by Stuart Douglass

A DECLARATION OF INTENT

by a dancer

Norma Cohen dance and movement teacher, born Liverpool, April 20, 1945. Studied dance at the Labour Art of Movement Studio for two years, then drama at Trent Park Training College. Taught English and Drama at Edgware Secondary School, now teaches Movement at Woodberry Down Comprehensive School. Ballet critic for Morning Star, *theatre critic for* Challenge Magazine. *Numerous dance productions —including school productions with audience participation. Choreographed and produced 'Guernica!', a dance-drama with speech, poetry, movement and music, based on the Spanish Civil War; likewise 'Murder in the Cathedral' in dance-drama form with forty schoolchildren. Produced concerts to raise money for Medical Aid to Vietnam. Taking a group of teenagers to the World Youth Festival in Bulgaria, August 1968, to tour with stage productions.*

I'M certainly not one of a cult. I don't think movement is life and have an ungodly irreverence for those that do, but I think the potential of dance is great and as yet in this country unexploited. Those who *do* exploit it certainly go to town with a vengeance. Masochism, indifference, tortuous despair are all the rage on the modern dance stage today. Inevitably, introversion of ideas leads to total preoccupation with the *dance*, and no regard for the audience. Dance—to me—is theatre, and as such must reach out to the audience and say something, be it important, exciting or shocking.

That's the trouble with so many modern dancers—or rather

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

choreographers—today. Ideas and communication go by the board. All that remains is a cold, technical confection in glitter wrapping—no humanity left.

'. . . the human condition?' Dancing in a vacuum, however candy-striped or plastic helps no one—even if cathartic for the dancer.

But I can envisage such exciting things—movement being integrated in a total theatre—of music, speech, poetry, dance, tapes, back-projection—the lot. Something which is really colourful, exciting, impactive. Something which hits you.

This is what I try to do through my teaching. To show the kids how exciting life can be. None of this ABA stuff—witches and fairies and jump up like a jack-in-the-box. Make them express what they really feel about things that count.

The response is tremendous, they become really keen to produce things and even take over the whole show. That's when I feel I've done a good job—when I'm no longer necessary.

This is why I feel so guilty about wanting to give up teaching. When you're a dancer you want to dance—you want to get through to an audience and create dynamite on the stage. I love this excitement. Sometimes I feel that it's only when I'm on stage that I'm really alive.

And then I think of the kids, and the importance of education, and feel guilty. Ambition can be a dreadful thing. But it's only because dance hasn't yet acquired the status it has in other countries that it's considered infra-dig, unimportant, or 'only a fringe interest'.

And why? Because if you're not commercial you're out. People have been deliberately conditioned to synthetic West End trivia.

It strikes me that people with uncommercial propositions have to compromise—or shut up shop. This society has a shameful effect on people. I see young kids at school with ambition and real creative talent shrugging their shoulders and ending up in run-of-the-mill jobs.

What's the use? They haven't got the money, the ruthlessness, the competitive know-how that this rotten society demands. In such a framework, it's impossible to change people's values. These can only change when conditions change. What's needed is a complete rethinking of what is important—greater subsidies to theatres, more art centres and civic theatres, more emphasis on creative subjects in education.

I can't condone this incredible waste of talent, stunting of ambition. What we need is a socialist society.

NORMA COHEN

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cartoons by Scorpio

(The rumour is denied that before resigning George Brown had suggested that he should become Ambassador in Moscow).

"Come, come, George, you wouldn't have liked Moscow anyway, all those socialists walking about as if they own the place."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"But Lyndon, I can't have Michael Foot drafted in the Army. We don't have it here."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brian
Blain

JAZZ TODAY AND TOMORROW

THE MARXIST LEFT have for many years had a curiously Jekyll and Hyde approach to jazz. On the one hand although Communists and Socialists played a leading part in proselytising and propagandising on behalf of the music in the late thirties and forties, the early days of the New Orleans revival, both in the US and here (the higher and middle echelons of the entertainment business are stuffed solid with ex-'reds' of one shade or another) and although Marxists and neo-Marxists have been instrumental in writing most of the worthwhile non-musical studies of the subject in the past, Sidney Finkelstein's *Jazz a People's Music* and Francis Newton's *The Jazz Scene* being two classics in this field, there was always another body of orthodox Marxist opinion which thoroughly disapproved of the music. This latter body, of course, were confirmed in their views, and still are to an extent, by the 'official' view in Eastern Europe. Even to this day the further East we travel the less enthusiastic the cultural establishment becomes about what they believe to be one of the more unpleasant artistic manifestations of Western capitalism.

This is a cliché of course; but the dull clang of the well-worn axe of 'nationalism' in music still continues to 'enliven' what we might be pleased to call Marxist musical discussion in this country, even though the era of artistic and political certainty which produced this kind of theory has been over this past decade.

At the risk of over-simplification, it is a fact that the increasingly embattled position of the American Negro has made a complete mockery of the 'Western decadence' theory of jazz inferiority. Whilst the music has always had a strong element of protest about it even from its earliest days, and particularly in its pre-history of blues, spiritual, gospel and work song (see Leroi Jones' *Blues People* for an excellent account of the militant nature of the American Negro's music through the past 300 years), it is mainly in the past ten years that a sizeable number of leading jazz musicians have taken up overtly political stances and drawn a clear relationship between the way they play and what they think. Further, a larger number than ever before see far more clearly than their predecessors that the actual white power structure in America, and how it manifests itself in control of the media and outlets for their work, results in an ever-increasing frustration in relation to employment opportunities. A recent book, *Four Lives in the BeBop Business* by A. B. Spellman, spells out this message with great clarity and force in its treatment of the work of Cecil Taylor and Ornette Coleman, two leading contemporary Negro musicians, in particular.

But the tragedy of the new Negro militant today is that he has been manoeuvred into a blind alley. The older generation of important Negro leaders, such as Louis Armstrong, Duke Ellington, Count Basie, Jimmy Lunceford and Chick Webb, for example, were still geared to the overall entertainment structure (the first pair still are). However sophisticated their music became in certain respects, it never lost the ability to reach a large number of people, to provide a functional background for their dancing, or as an adjunct to such activities as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Cotton Club shows, the tap dancers and chorus lines at Negro theatres such as the Apollo in Harlem. This 'functional' aspect of the music has now largely been taken over by rock 'n roll, R. & B. and the whole phenomenon of 'pop' in general.

The great problem that minority manifestations of art present for socialists is how much is their failure to communicate due to their innate weaknesses as a means of artistic expression, or, with particular reference to jazz, how much to the petit bourgeois conceptions of the entertainment industry, and its determination, conscious or otherwise, to trivialise and titillate at all costs, rather than rouse, excite and move.

The fact is that all young musicians, not just jazz musicians, are faced with similar problems in this respect. The world of capitalism is essentially a philistine world, and even when the middle class *is* culturally aware it tends to be more interested in artifacts which it can own in a kind of conspicuous consumption, or prestige events that it can attend, like Covent Garden or Glyndebourne. This does not mean, of course, that the artistic offerings that are being 'consumed' are worthless—far from it, but that's another problem: the one of democratisation of the arts.

But this is the kind of social background to the problems of many jazz performers today. Their music, however worthwhile, has neither status, for it cannot be conspicuously consumed, nor, with few exceptions, much value as commercial enterprise. Consider, for example, how much worthwhile music could be presented with the 26,000 dollars which has just been spent on only the *cover* of the latest Rolling Stones LP. When assessing how music gets across to sizeable audiences, one should never underestimate the amount of positive selling which goes into, frequently, but not always, inferior music. An appeal to a minority at any one given time in the history of an art form is not of itself evidence of either superiority or inferiority of artistic achievement: it is just that many socialists are remarkably naive on this question of populism.

A recent example in relation to jazz was provided in *The Observer* by that brilliant critic and good socialist, Kenneth Tynan, who referred to the energy going into pop which formerly went into jazz. Leaving aside the question of whether the amount of energy put into musical performance is much of a criterion on which to base any artistic judgement, it would have been far more accurate if he had spoken of the amount of capital which goes into popular music.

The Negro musician unfortunately very often tends to particularise his situation—to confuse it with his overall status as a second class citizen. You don't have to be an American Negro to be a poorly paid jazz artist. One is likely to be worse off if one is, say, British and white (ask Stan Tracey —a most original jazz pianist, who, despite wide critical acclaim, is constantly on a knife edge of pauperism). In other words, in terms of where the major developments still are in the USA, the socialist outsider has to point out, as sympathetically as possible, that the Negro musician's problems are due in the final count to the structure of the society he lives in and that they are not uniquely his problem, rather being the problem of all new artists struggling under capitalism everywhere.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNMENT CUTS (1)

The Councils

Solly Kaye

THE present attack on living standards, rising prices, wage freezing, unemployment, also severely affects the social services. We know the extent of the cuts nationally, and how they affect the school leaving age, school feeding, prescription charges, etc. But what is not so well known, is the way Government policy is affecting the work of Borough Councils. With costs constantly rising, cost of land, materials, interest rates, and (due to rising prices) the cost of labour, Councils face three alternatives. They must either raise rates which rightly meets a storm of opposition from ratepayers. Or they must get higher Government grants, which are not forthcoming, and are indeed being reduced in certain cases. Or accept arms spending and reduce the social services.

Some argue that there is a fourth alternative, to increase efficiency. Although there are grounds for accepting that increased efficiency can help in certain areas, this does not get to the root of the problem. The price of land, interest rates, the cost of materials, are not directly affected by increasing councils' efficiency. Yet these are among the main causes of increased local government expenditure. These factors are based upon political decisions. Any government that was serious about tackling the social services would have to deal with the basic problems of land, labour, materials, and finance. It would take decisions that would bring it into conflict with the banks, the landlords, and other capitalist interests. It is because the Labour Government has failed to do this that it has created such disillusionment, despair and anger among millions of Labour voters.

See how Government policy affects my own council as an example. Each year, rates have risen staggeringly. With every attempt to provide more housing, a new heavy debt burden is added. Every new road development, street lighting, dust cart, sewer renewal, means more loans, more debts to moneylenders at huge cost in interest repayments.

This year Tower Hamlets will be paying well over £2 m. in loans charges, the overwhelming amount as interest.

This year our Housing Revenue Account will be £1,300,000 in the red. The District Auditor demands increases in rents from our 12,800 tenants. His target is an extra £700,000 a year in two stages, starting in April.

This year the London Boroughs Association has demanded a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

change in the way the Rate Evaluation Fund operates. Their proposals will mean that Tower Hamlets must find an extra £1,700,000 a year.

This year the share of our Housing Revenue Account borne by the Exchequer has dropped from 27 per cent in 1964 to 20 per cent, depriving the borough of £180,000 it would otherwise have received.

This year the Council in common with others, has been asked to make the maximum possible cuts in its estimated expenditure. The Minister, Greenwood, doesn't call them cuts in social services. He just refers to the fact that we shall have to 'forgo certain advances' that have been planned.

And how does it work out? Economies are made that cut over £300,000 out of this year's Revenue Account, and over £700,000 out of our capital estimates. What kind of 'advances' have been forgone that are going to make such a contribution to helping Britain's export drive. How is the Tower Hamlets Council backing Britain? By cutting £100,000 from its estimates for sewer reconstruction! By deferring the building of a sick room and work shed at an old people's home to save £1,400. By deferring a branch library on the Isle of Dogs where now only a mobile Library serves the people. By deferring the repair and improvement of public conveniences. By cutting opening times of the local lending libraries by half a day each week. By deferring the provision of three centres for handicapped people, and a holiday home for the handicapped. By saving £150 on TV sets for handicapped people.

Such patriotism! Such a tremendous gesture to help our exports! A Health Centre and School Dental Clinic—deferred. The decoration of old people's homes—deferred. Local film shows and lectures, attended largely by older citizens—cut by £500. Local exhibitions in the Library foyer, cut by £150. And so we see the eating away of services already won, as well as delay in providing services long believed to be essential. And why? The interest paid by our borough on its housing alone could more than wipe out all these economies. We pay over £100,000 an acre for land—with Government approval. Huge profits are made on every large building project, with government approval. Every purchase we make from a cup and saucer to a new refuse collection vehicle, adds profits for someone with Government approval.

Surely the time has come to stop Councils becoming a new, gilt-edged investment for the private capitalist? They loan the money, the Council collects and pays over the interest. The worker pays for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it all, from his earnings. How much longer can councils go on in this dilemma? To raise the rates, or to raise the rents, or cut the services. Sometime soon a Council somewhere must give a lead, as the Poplar Councillors did in the 1920s when times were over-ripe for change.

There is no common sense reason why Councils should pay interest at 7 per cent or more. No reason why its materials cannot be supplied from a central pool by the Government. No reason why land should not be nationalised and provided to local Councils for their social requirements.

What can a nation lose if its people are properly housed, educated, and cared for? And how terrible the consequences where a nation allows people to live in slums, be educated in slums, be starved of cultural facilities, be deprived of trained personnel—to teach, to nurse, to cure, to protect.

There are signs that Labour Councillors in many places are fed up to the teeth with Government policy. My own Council is protesting at the slowness in slum clearance by the Greater London Council; and at the way in which surplus railway lands have been held back in spite of promises that they would be made available for housing and other local social purposes.

My Council is protesting against the reorganisation of rate equalisation in London. It has also challenged the District Auditor by refusing to impose the amount of rent increases he expects, or agree to his timing of the increases. But this is not enough. There will be no change until Councils recognise that the only way to change Government policy is by action in which huge numbers of people and organisations are involved. And giving way to pressure for huge rent increases, by making smaller increases, is no answer. For it accepts the principle of increases in rents. And events have shown that it isn't any answer.

There are thousands of Councillors up and down the country who give time, thought and energy to their work. Huge numbers are sincere, hard working, and socialist. Every attack on a social service is resented. And they know that these attacks are unjustified.

All that the right wing can do is to appeal to 'loyalty'. But, as one of our Labour Councillors asked at the last Council meeting, 'Am I to be loyal to my leaders, or to the programme on which I was elected?' This question must now be answered. Unless it is, we are seeing the start of the biggest-ever attack on our social services, an essential corner stone of our standard of life.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GOVERNMENT CUTS (2)

Youth

Martin Jacques

THE history of the 'sixties will surely give no insignificant attention to the growing political consciousness and activity of young people. A great deal has been written about the new generation, but too little has been about its political responsiveness and too little has been genuinely analytical.

This is the first generation which has grown up in three essentially different environmental conditions. Firstly, they have matured in a Britain which has been experiencing a rapidly declining imperialist position, staggering from economic crisis to crisis, and each small and each large cycle has been more acute than the previous one. Youth's response to this has been political and ideological to a far greater extent than any equivalent previous generation, particularly in the context of a world outlook as illustrated by youth's involvement in the fight for peace more than any other single issue.

Secondly, present-day youth is relatively uncontaminated by the cold-war period of the late 'forties and early 'fifties and has tended by its actions to observe and react to situations with a freshness of approach and an inquiring mind, reflected for example in the distinct lack of a traditional anti-communist attitude as illustrated in the broad unity of youth and student organisations on such issues as Vietnam.

Thirdly, in this setting, young people have witnessed the anachronism of Tory rule and its rubber-stamp in right-wing Labour government in quick succession. 'Labour is ready, poised to swing its plans into instant operation, impatient to apply the new thinking that will end the chaos and sterility', declared the Labour Party's election manifesto in 1964 in a campaign noted for its appeal to youth. And yet what is the picture for youth in this 'New Britain'? Over 560,000 unemployed, including 40,000 teenagers, frozen wages, rising prices, increased school meal charges, miserable educational and job opportunities with pitifully few apprenticeships, only 25 per cent of university students from working-class backgrounds, and perhaps, above all, the ideological, political and moral degradation of British capitalist society in general and Britain's support for the American war in Vietnam and their attitude to Southern Africa in particular.

This was all before devaluation and the series of January cuts. For many young people these latest developments mean two things,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

firstly, the most severe attack yet on their living standards and secondly, a further condemnation of the system under which we live, even if this latter reaction is not yet reflected in any clear socialist alternative, although this is increasingly the case.

For youth, the smokescreen of defence cuts to hide the real meaning of the social service cuts, the savage attack on people's living conditions must have an initial appeal, but like 'Back Britain' it is rapidly losing its gloss to reveal its Wilsonian emptiness.

Instead, the cuts strike at youth in their multiplicity of occupations and interests and leave the problem of peace and Britain's 'defence' untouched. Like the rest of the community, they face the scissor movement of frozen wages and rising prices and rents, sharpened by the large pool of unemployed, and their struggle here is intimately bound up with that of the labour movement. These more general problems have been dealt with in detail elsewhere, although their threat to youth is perhaps greater because of their implications for the future. Moreover, the relatively lower level of organisation of young workers poses particular problems in their fight.

More specifically, perhaps the most severe attack is in the field of education. Cuts of over £100 m. are to be made in national educational expenditure over the next two years, and with the postponement of the raising of the school-leaving age to 16 until 1973, school-building projects to the value of £36 m. in both 1968-69 and 1969-70, which were necessary as part of this measure, are to be stopped. This postponement will further perpetuate the class divisions within our educational expenditure, striking most deeply at the opportunities of the working-class child, especially in industrial areas and severely injuring the future of comprehensive education.

Coupled with this body-blow are a series of smaller educational 'Scrooge-cuts' which, as *The Guardian* leader of January 17 pointed out, were designed simply to placate the anti-welfare desires and prejudices of the foreign bankers; the ending of free school milk to save £5 m. per annum (when 43 per cent of Britain's children live in families which on average fail to reach BMA standards for protein and calcium intake): a £1 m. cut in the youth service expenditure (almost invisible as it is): a £2 m. reduction in expenditure on new libraries: cuts in capital expenditure in future education, particularly in the university sector to save a few more million (and to save Britain?). There will even be a saving of £13 m. by cutting payments to direct grant schools which will serve to increase their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

selectivity by fee-payers. Moreover, the Government's intention to hold down local government spending to a 3 per cent increase in 1968-69—a considerable decrease on previous rises—will hit education as the biggest item and inevitably other such 'victims' as the Youth Employment Service and discretionary awards to students in many cases.

And the students? Not only has the concept of a higher student standard of living been dismissed but the Government have actually announced that any proposed grant increase merely to make good cost-of-living increases since the last rise three years ago will be cut by half, saving an estimated £12 m. and placing students nearer the bread-line, as a *Times* article of January 31 indicated. At this rate the student standard of living will by 1970 have declined nearly 30 per cent over the previous decade.

This attack on the student body, the most organised and organisable section of young people has a number of other features. The cost-of-living estimate which will have been submitted to the Department of Education and Science by the time this article is read, has been calculated before the consequences of devaluation and a number of rises in such items as hall fees have taken effect, the latter having been kept 'steady' during the period of restraint but which Gordon Walker has said the Government will no longer intervene to hold down.

Gradually the student movement, in its changing mood of increasing militancy, has begun to react to this attack. A joint declaration was issued by the National Union of Students' Executive and representatives of Conservative, Labour and Communist students (joined by the Liberals) flatly rejecting the 50 per cent cut. The next four months should witness a mounting campaign by students against the Government, but much will depend on the assistance students receive from other sections of the population, particularly the labour movement.

In 1886 the Committee on Depression stated that one of the main causes of Britain's 'depression' was her inadequate educational system, especially with reference to the economic challenge of Germany and the United States. Eighty years later, and even right-wing social democrats have not learnt this lesson. Such people are not fit to rule.

In the fields of health and housing too, young people will share the hardships of the offensive with other sections of the community. The imposition of prescription charges to save a miserly £25 m. per

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

annum (Lawrence Pavitt, MP, estimates £12 m. to £15 m. only)—so that the Government can spend the same amount as aid to Big Business in the British Leyland Motor Corporation merger—and the cuts on council house building (and the abandonment, of course, of the 500,000 annual housing target) will hit young people as much as anyone. What of the prospects of young people getting somewhere decent to live now—unless they are sons and daughters of big private landlords themselves?

These are some of the main effects on young people; they too will suffer like every other section of the working population and they face with apprehension another round of the axe with the Bankers' Budget on March 19.

But the reaction of many young people will be at two levels, firstly the direct personal economic effects and secondly the general dilemma and bankruptcy of the whole system which they face, and this general reaction can express itself negatively to include all political parties and the labour movement. Herein lies the challenge.

Young people have proved themselves in numerous cases to be progressive by nature and in theory and practice. But to win them for the positive and constructive fight against these cuts, which breed individual cynicism and disillusionment, is a challenge to the whole of the left movement.

ADEN, THE GULF AND OIL

Céline Whittleton

IS the decision to withdraw the military forces from the Persian Gulf as sudden and as final as we are told? This particular part of the package deal that Mr. Wilson offered us on January 16 has raised surprisingly little comment. Yet for decades, and until only a few months ago, the British bases in the Gulf were said to be a vital safeguard for our oil supplies and for the investments of the oil companies. Only last November Mr. Goronwy Roberts, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, on a visit to the area said publicly that Britain would stay there as long as necessary 'to maintain peace and stability'.

An important aspect of the January announcement on the military withdrawal is that no action is to be taken on it for the time being. Not for three to four years, in fact, since it is not proposed to leave the bases before the end of 1971. There should be no difficulty in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evacuating a comparatively small force of 10,000 to 12,000 men in a matter of a few months. After all that has been said by Government spokesmen on their very special interest in the Persian Gulf, the lengthy delay is clearly for the purpose of arranging for a new form of tutelage over the area, to be set up with the active co-operation of the British Government.

In May 1967 King Faisal of Saudi Arabia paid a long visit to Britain to reaffirm the new links established by the £120 million contract for the defence system he had bought shortly before and which included Lightning Supersonic fighters and Thunderbolt missiles 'complete with British mercenary pilots' (*Financial Times*, May 8, 1967). And it was widely rumoured at the time that another armaments contract of the same magnitude was being negotiated with further promise of assistance from British staff.

The new links with Faisal coincided with the preparations for the British withdrawal from Aden and the rest of the South Arabian Federation, and the Saudi monarch was confidently expected to take over the role of protector of the feudal rulers of the Aden hinterland propped up until then by the British Government and given a majority of seats on the Council of the British-sponsored Federation. But events in Aden and South Arabia put an abrupt end to these plans. In a matter of three months, from mid-June to mid-September, the advance of the nationalist forces brought about the complete collapse of the rulers and of the Federal Government. One by one the seventeen protégés were removed or forced to offer a hasty resignation before leaving for other shores. Even the thinly disguised hope that chaos would follow the departure of the British troops was frustrated. Whatever the problems still confronting the new People's Republic of South Yemen on its way to political and economic development, one thing is certain: its people have proved themselves capable of taking their affairs in their own hands and of ridding themselves at last of the grotesque band of sultans and emirs who vanished from the scene even before their British protectors had made their own departure.

It is this kind of ruler that the British troops in Bahrain and the Trucial States are intended to defend and perpetuate, with the difference that much bigger interests than in Aden are at stake. Besides the three big independent States—Iran, Iraq and Saudi Arabia—there are eleven small States and principalities around the oil-rich shores of the Persian Gulf: Kuwait, Bahrain, Qatar, the seven Trucial States and the Sultanate of Muscat and Oman—all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of them in Treaty relations of one kind or another with Britain. The treaties were originally conceived in the days of the East India Company and later of the Indian empire. They have been maintained to serve the interests of the oil companies whose concessionary rights are held by virtue of long-term agreements obtained in many cases from rulers bound by the treaties.

The revealed estimates of the Persian Gulf oilfields represent 60 per cent of the world's oil reserves and their current production about 25 per cent of the world total. In 1966 the oil produced in the area amounted to 463 million tons, two-thirds of this from Iran, Iraq and Saudi Arabia and the rest from Kuwait and the other principalities. Virtually the whole production of oil in the Gulf countries is at present in the hands of foreign monopolies including French, Dutch and Japanese companies but mostly American and British. The share of US companies in this enormous wealth is 53 per cent. That of the British companies is around 30 per cent held for a very large part by Shell and British Petroleum whose combined profits in 1966 amounted to £465 m.

Small wonder therefore that the continuation of the political set-up which has made it possible to lay hands on this immense wealth has always been the central preoccupation of the exploiting companies and of the Governments backing them. How 'to maintain peace and stability' in this context means how to avoid disturbing the convenient status quo in the face of the developing Arab revolution which has raised before the foreign companies the dreaded spectre of nationalisation.

But there is little peace of mind for the foreign interests in the Middle East these days. In recent times the military presence itself has proved a mixed blessing. The British troops, like the British-officered local forces, are in reality a police force to put down rebellions and to make it possible to displace without too much trouble a recalcitrant ruler, like the ruler of Sharjah, one of the Trucial Coast sheikhdoms, who was removed in June 1965 soon after he had declared himself in favour of co-operation with the Arab League. But the troops have become a too obvious symbol of the imperialist hold over the area and a target for the Arab nationalist movement. Even more important, one Middle East crisis after another have made it clear that the military presence does not in fact enable the pro-imperialist rulers to resist popular pressure. The most recent example was the ban on oil deliveries to Britain and the US at the time of the Israeli war in June 1967. To dictate oil policy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at every turn seems to require a much bigger force than the one which can be displayed, let alone afforded, by the British Government. Little doubt could remain after the Aden fiasco. Far from imposing a hated political regime, the British troops were defeated by the local population and had to witness the collapse of the regime before their departure.

The search for other ways and means to maintain the status quo in the Persian Gulf is not without problems. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Stewart may look on Faisal and his like with mixed feelings, uneasiness at the repulsive social system that they represent and uncertainty at their chances of survival. Nevertheless there is little doubt that their proposed alternative is a new military alliance centred on Saudi Arabia and Iran, an alliance that would certainly retain the support of imperialist power in the background. The US Government's proclaimed fear that the end of the British presence would create a dangerous power vacuum is blatantly hypocritical. The US has long maintained its own formidable presence in the area. Planes and troops from the Sixth Fleet in the Eastern Mediterranean are within reach of the Persian Gulf. The US and Britain are members of the CENTO alliance under which Iran is armed and advised. Like Britain, the US is involved in the Saudi military set-up and has at least a staging post in the Dahran base. Besides, Britain's own military base in Cyrpus is not without means of threatening the Persian Gulf.

This is the background in which the new Saudi-Iran alliance is being canvassed. Its wisdom, even from the point of view of the monopolies, may well be questioned. The two big brothers are not without their own ambitions on the lands that they would be supposed to protect. The Shah of Iran has long claimed Bahrain as his 14th province, by virtue of a Persian occupation that was terminated 185 years ago. The Saudi king has his own claim on the Buraimi oasis and the oilfields around it in the sheikhdom of Abu Dhabi.

The day may not be far off when the peoples of the oil countries will seek their own form of unity in their struggle for independence, for social progress and for the control of their economy. Meanwhile, they have little to gain from an alliance between reactionary rulers.

If disengagement from the Persian Gulf is to serve Britain's true interests, and to be the first step towards friendly relations with the people of the area, the only course is to withdraw without further hesitation and without ulterior motives. Support for a reactionary alliance can only bring discredit on its sponsors.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHITHER GERMANY? *

Gordon Schaffer

IN the blizzard winter of 1947, I was in Berlin gathering material for a book about what was then the Soviet Zone of Germany. I found that no less than fourteen million new schoolbooks had already been printed to ensure the elimination of Nazi propaganda from the schools and that 40,000 teachers had been trained to replace members of the Nazi party. I mentioned to another journalist that this story was available by simply calling at the education department ten minutes away from the press hotel. 'Don't be a bloody fool', he said, 'if I send that story, I'll be accused of Communist propaganda and they'll call me back.' That is what happened to a number of journalists; Wilfred Burchett of the *Daily Express*, and John Peet of Reuters threw up their jobs so as to be able to write the truth.

Because Germany is still the focal point of the cold war and the success of socialism in the German Democratic Republic the most feared development as far as the cold war forces in the West are concerned, there have been more lies told about the GDR than any of the other European socialist countries. The campaign almost reached the level of the early days of the Soviet revolution when a certain Perceval Landon of *The Daily Telegraph* 'confirmed' from his haven in Constantinople that in Bolshevik Russia the women were being nationalised and were either committing suicide or being shot by relations to escape a 'fate worse than death'.

The vicious campaign against the GDR has been systematically coupled with personal attacks on Walter Ulbricht, chairman of the Council of State of the GDR and first secretary of the central committee of the Socialist Unity Party. This volume in English with its selection of Ulbricht's speeches and writings, not only during the postwar period, but during the working-class struggles from the Weimar period onwards is therefore particularly valuable and deserves a wide circulation.

It uses the best weapon of all against these calumnies—truth. Here we can see how Ulbricht warned in the Weimar period of the danger of the alliance between German militarism and the great monopolies, how he analysed the nature of Fascism before the victory of Hitler and how he battled for the unity of the working

* "Wither Germany?" by Walter Ulbricht, 438 pp.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class as the only way to save the German people from catastrophe. And in his postwar writings we see how these lessons were applied in the building of the German Democratic Republic. This book will also help us to understand why progressives in both German Republics have sounded the alarm as the leaders of the Federal Republic repeat step by step the measures which led to fascism and war.

In December 1930, Ulbricht warned in a speech in Berlin that the emergency decrees of the Brüning government were the 'road to fascism, meaning hunger for millions of working people as well as increased armament to prepare a war of intervention against the Soviet Union'. He showed how the 'stabilisation' of the country's finances was designed to ensure a shifting of income in favour of finance capital by cutting allowances to the sick and disabled, to expectant mothers and the unemployed, and by cuts in school meals, housing and other social services, while increasing expenditure on armaments. He warned:

> The rulers of the 'Third Reich' which Herr Brüning has begun to establish are the owners of the factories, the land and the banks. They are the leaders of German trust capital and they determine the policy. The nazis and their organisations having ensnared broad masses of the petty bourgeoisie and parts of the workers by their radical phraseology can only lead the masses of the working people to the fascist state system in the interests of finance capital and on its orders and can impose their bloody reign of terror on the vanguard of the working class only hand in hand with the fascist police and the Reichswehr.

As the fascist terror mounted he urged in speeches and articles united action—'direct joint measures of struggle against the common enemy'.

> All obstacles must be overcome, so that all workers meet in every enterprise, no matter what membership card they have in their pocket to deliberate on fighting measures against fascist terror and pay cuts, against the possible ban on the Communist Party.

In 1936, when the Hitler regime was openly preparing for war, Ulbricht renewed his demand for united action and condemned the right-wing social democratic leaders who even in exile were declaring their opposition to joint action. In 1938, in a camouflaged leaflet circulated illegally in Germany, he repeated the warning:

> Today there is a community of destiny that links Ernst Thaelmann with Mierendorff, Chaplain Roissant and Pastor Niemoeller who are locked up in gaol as hostages of the brown-shirted war provocateurs. Unity, unity and unity again, an end to all divisions among honest anti-fascists. That is the road by which the opponents of Hitler, today linked by a common destiny of suffering, must become masters of tomorrow through their community of struggle for a new Germany of peace and freedom.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The same lesson was repeated in illegal leaflets to the people and armed forces of Hitler Germany during the war years.

This is the background to the story of the creation and consolidation of the German Democratic Republic which is vividly told in this book in a series of speeches and articles. The German workers and peasants in this part of Germany have become 'Masters of Tomorrow'.

In the light of the lessons learned in the struggle against fascism, the creation of the Socialist Unity Party was clearly the first task after liberation. Communists and Socialists had suffered together. Their programmes had the same objectives. 'The night of fascism', Ulbricht commented, 'had been able to spread only because of the disunity of the working class.' The propaganda in the West about a 'shot gun marriage' imposed by the Russians is seen as sheer nonsense. The Western powers by pressures, bribery and other measures destroyed the natural urge to unity in their zones. They prevented the moves to create a united trade union movement in the whole of Germany and split the World Federation of Trade Unions as the first step to the division of Germany and Europe.

Ulbricht also shows in this volume how the decisions of the Potsdam conference, which provided not only for the elimination of the Nazis but for the removal of the causes of fascism, were carried out in the Soviet Zone and betrayed in the Western Zones. In 1945 none of the powers could openly challenge the people's demand for an anti-fascist peace. At the election both parties in Britain had pledged themselves never to permit a revival of German militarism. The Potsdam agreement specified how fascism was to be uprooted. The four-power control commission set out in a series of directives how the war criminals and active Nazis were to be removed from all key positions. The commission also laid down that the great trusts who had made Hitler's regime possible, were to be treated as war criminals.

It was on this basis that the Soviet Zone carried through the expropriation of the great landowners and the taking over by the community of the enterprises of the Nazi criminals. A plebiscite in Saxony supporting the takeover received 77.7 per cent of the votes. In Hesse in the American Zone there was a similar vote, but the US vetoed any action. In the British Zone, the Labour government even vetoed a German request to nationalise the mines.

The reality which soon emerged was that the anti-fascist programme of Potsdam demanded a class struggle against the forces

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that created fascism and that was the last thing the Western powers were prepared to accept.

The subsequent story of Germany vividly told in this book is of the separate developments in the two German states. The GDR went on striving for measures to begin the process of reunification until the arming of the Federal Republic under Hitler's generals made any such action impossible.

The state frontier in Berlin (the so-called wall) in August 1961 was the inevitable response to the open provocations and threats of war by the Federal Republic. Ulbricht said on that occasion that the action of the GDR 'had saved peace in Europe and the world'. He also stated what official circles in London admitted privately at the time, that 'many Nato politicians were obviously relieved when they received reports that this dangerous situation for peace had been eliminated'.

Again and again, through these postwar years, Ulbricht has put forward, on behalf of the government of the GDR proposals for disarmament, for non-aggression agreements, for co-operation on the basis of peace between West Germany and the other Nato powers. He said in his report to the Socialist Unity Party Congress in January 1963:

> We want to tell all West German citizens clearly and unmistakably, a peaceful settlement of the German question is possible only with a renunciation of multilateral nuclear armament, a renunciation of revenge and with good will for disarmament. A policy of non-recognition of the GDR excludes every possibility of reunification . . . And there can be a united Germany only when the two German states disarm and are militarily neutral.

That warning should be heard in London as well as Bonn.

COLLECTOR'S ITEM

A reader has very generously donated a *complete set* of bound volumes of *Labour Monthly*, from the first issue in 1921 to 1967. This magnificent gift, for which we are deeply grateful, presents a unique opportunity to readers. Whoever buys these volumes will not only be acquiring a rare collector's item; he or she will also be helping us to cope with our very difficult financial problems, as the entire proceeds of the sale will go to *LM*.

We accordingly invite readers to submit their offers of purchase at the earliest opportunity.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STUDENT TROUBLE AT CAMBRIDGE IN 1918

(Vice-Chancellor's letter to Lord Curzon on two 'very sinister' brothers.)

A reader, conducting research in the Public Records Office, has sent us a copy of the following letter he has come across from the Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University to the Foreign Secretary, Lord Curzon, in March 1919:

(Copy)
Public Records Office, F.O. 371/4243

PRIVATE
CHRIST'S COLLEGE LODGE,
CAMBRIDGE.
March 21, 1919

Dear Lord Curzon,

I have seen Mr. Benians, who looks after the Indian students here on behalf of the India Office. We have two students named Bhat: I don't know which you refer to. One has the initials M.D. and is at Trinity Hall. I should think he is the one in question.

Mr. Benians has looked after the Indians for several years, and he tells me there is, on the whole, a good feeling between them and the students here, and he is inclined to think that the most regrettable incident at the National Liberal Club was due more to the high spirits and thoughtlessness of these young men than to real malice. At the same time he tells me that both the students mentioned in your letter are of rather a poor class. 'Third-rate men' he calls them.

On the other hand, we have some very sinister characters here. As far as I can find out, the worst elements are Mr. C. P. Dutt of Queens' College, now demonstrating in the Botanical Laboratory, and his brother Mr. R. P. Dutt who was, I am told, senior classical scholar at Balliol, and I believe was sent down. I have written to Mr. Lionel Smith* to find out the truth. Their father is an Indian doctor married to a Swedish woman, and practising in a poor part of the town. They are men of extraordinary ability and have quite got control of the Socialist Club here, though they never appear in public. In my opinion they ought to be very closely watched.

I am seeing the College Tutors about the men you refer to, and if anything further transpires, I will let you know.

Yours very faithfully,
(sgd.) A. E. Shipley
Vice-Chancellor.

* A. L. Smith, who became Master of Balliol.

As usual with university authorities, the Vice-Chancellor was out of date in his information. R.P.D. was in Cambridge in 1918, after he had been sent down from Oxford for propaganda of Marxism in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

October 1917. By the time of the Vice-Chancellor's letter in March 1919, he was fully engaged in London as Secretary of the International Section of the Labour Research Department.

This letter provides evidence that the signatory expected a response from tutors as part of the system for spying on students, and illustrates the methods of snooping and reporting from Vice-Chancellor to Foreign Secretary on 'student trouble' half a century ago.

A WAY TO WIN NEW READERS

The effects of the deepening crisis of world capitalism are being felt in Britain with increasing sharpness. Now more than ever *LM* has a vital rôle to play in explaining the issues and offering practical guides to action. Our readers, who represent the most thoughtful sections of the labour movement, are armed with a scientific understanding of these issues—the more readers we have, the more successful will be the fight for peace and socialism.

Every individual reader of *LM* can help to boost circulation. On the back cover we print a form with room for two names and addresses of friends or workmates who you consider are prospective readers. Fill it in, post it to us and we will do the rest. If you like to add a covering note of your own to be forwarded with the free specimen copy, better still.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

The world war in the coal industry has created an entirely new situation and threatens to assume ruinous proportions throughout the entire coalfields of the world. Prior to the War, Great Britain held the field and dominated the whole of the European market with its huge export of coal amounting to 73,400,000 tons. This has led many ignorant observers to believe that Great Britain could still maintain the same proportions. There is a very true saying, 'There are none so blind as those who will not see' . . . In Britain our position is more desperate than ever before. Three hundred pits have been closed down during 1927. While the coal output is more than 30 per cent below potential capacity, inland consumption has shrunk enormously owing to the condition of the great iron and steel industries, which consumed so much coal. Imports of foreign iron and steel, which are dumped on the British market, have increased rapidly. In short, Great Britain is dumping coal on the Continent at lower prices than it can be produced there, and from the Continent steel is being dumped in this country.

(From 'The World Wide Coal Crisis',
by A. J. Cook, *Labour Monthly*, April 1928.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Reformation to Industrial Revolution. A social and economic history of Britain 1530-1780
Christopher Hill
Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 254 pp; 42s.

THE ENGLISH BOURGEOIS REVOLUTION of the seventeenth century was a decisive stage in the transition from feudalism to capitalism and played an essential part in making possible the industrial revolution in England at the end of the eighteenth and in the early nineteenth century. This thesis, brilliantly expounded in various classic writings of Marx and Engels, has been developed by Christopher Hill in a series of studies of the economic and social changes which gave a unique character to the early history of English capitalism.

In 1961 Hill published a detailed study: *The Century of Revolution 1603-1714*. In this book he concentrated on a narrative of events and a general description of social, economic, religious and cultural changes, with many illustrative quotations from contemporary sources.

In the present book, he has adopted a wider canvas, covering the whole period from 1530 to 1780 while adhering to the same formula of general description and quotation. Hence he is not explicitly concerned with an analysis in terms of the development of forms of capitalist structure within feudal society or changes in political superstructure consequent on changes of the economic basis. True, he stresses his concern with 'interaction between politics and economics' and with 'the elements of the new' that went to the making of modern English society. But as regards the pre-history of the English revolution his general verdict is that the period was one of 'slow economic change'. He emphasises the decisive role of the revolution. Politically, he says, the gradual advance was 'interrupted by a sharp break after 1640', and 'the seventeenth century political revolutions gave rise to revolutions in trade and agriculture which had far-reaching effects on the whole of society'. There is no reference to the transition from feudalism to capitalism as such but, while insisting that 'the very conception of a dividing line between the Middle Ages and modern times is debatable', he begins each chapter of the section dealing with the Civil War with a sentence calling attention to the break with medieval conditions. Thus the chapter on the Revolution in Government begins: 'The sixteen-forties and fifties marked the end of medieval and Tudor England'. The next chapter begins: 'In agrarian relations the Middle Ages were brought to an end in 1646', and similar sentences start the chapters on industry, on finance, and on trade and foreign affairs.

While such words as capitalism, bourgeoisie, working class, class struggle, etc., do not figure in the index, the text has many references to particular classes. In the first section of the book Hill gives some account of the division into 'social classes' but in general terms and with hardly any statistical data. He notes the increase in the number of 'gentlemen' and also defines a group of 'middle class' as including 'most merchants, richer artisans, the independent peasantry (yeomanry) and well-to-do tenant farmers'. As regards the 'common people', he notes that some labour service survived at the end of the sixteenth century and that 'during this period a proletariat began to be differentiated from the rest of society organised in gilds and manors'. It is noticeable that in the second section of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the book he states: 'the civil war which began with a revolt of the nobles ended with a struggle between opposed social classes'. Furthermore, a valuable feature of the last section, on English society in the eighteenth century, is the vivid and sympathetic description of the lot of the growing working class, dispossessed poor and agricultural labourers. In this section, too, is his only reference to Marx. He says: 'Marx may have oversimplified and foreshortened a complicated process when he spoke of the independent yeomanry being succeeded by a servile rabble of tenant farmers on short leases; but taking the long view that is exactly what happened.'

With its wealth of information and telling quotations, this book provides a readable and thought-provoking guide for students without claiming to be exhaustive.

CLEMENS DUTT

William Morris. His Life, Work and Friends

Philip Henderson

Thames and Hudson, 388 pp., 63s.

PHILIP HENDERSON IN 1950 published a very useful collection of the letters of William Morris to his family and friends. Now he has produced a study of Morris' life and work. Comparison with his biographical introduction to the letters suggests that primarily one is an expansion of the other. But it is very much larger: Mr. Henderson has carefully read, and draws extensively upon, very many other works on the subject, particularly the poems and writings they quote, not easily come by otherwise. In a sense, the book is a kind of helpful Baedeker's Guide to literature about Morris. Moreover, it has been sumptuously produced. The type is large and handsome, the paper heavy, the pages not too crowded, and the illustrations—especially the reproductions of tapestry and paintings—very well done.

Nevertheless, the book leaves an impression of one-sidedness. Mr. Henderson devotes enormous space to the personal relations between Morris, his wife Jane and the poet Rossetti, and to tracing the reflection of these relations in Morris' poetry. He does it in such detail that at times one seems to be in the psychiatrist's consulting room, not in the world of literature. Of course William Morris like everyone else was a human being, and had his human troubles: but that was not among the aspects which made him a giant in his century. One cannot help recalling Morris' own biting words about the literature of future Socialist society, when men will no longer 'spin out their own insides, like silk-worms, into dreary yarns of sickly feelings and speculations': or other people's, he might have added.

With this, perhaps not by chance, Mr. Henderson does not trouble to conceal his own lack of sympathy with Morris' work and hopes for Socialism. A few examples. The 'Chants for Socialists', which inspired a whole generation of advanced workers, were 'more or less doggerel', and not as true an expression of Morris as his tapestries (pp. 238, 264). He did not expect the depths of vulgarity of 'popular culture' today, in spite of more education (p. 248)—when Morris' anticipations of what would happen if Socialist revolution were delayed are among his most mordant passages. Mr. Henderson at the same time cannot resist the temptation to make 'dull squalor' and 'hideous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

things' the characteristic features of Socialist society *after* the revolution as well (p. 277). Socialism, in Mr. Henderson's view, was really spread through the LCC and the Fabian Society (pp. 319-320)—and of course it would be an 'insult to Morris' intelligence' to treat *News From Nowhere* as having anything to do with Communism (p. 328).

These and other excursions into philistinism do little justice to the revolutionary William Morris.

ANDREW ROTHSTEIN

Heartbreak Housing

Frank Allaun, MP

Zenith Paperback, 126 pp., 5s.

FRANK ALLAUN IS NOT ONLY as well-informed as most of the academic experts but as active as anyone else in the country in practical and political activities on behalf of housing action. Above all, he is a man full of compassion.

Along with a factual survey of housing insufficiency and obsolescence, this book gives a summary account of the legislation available to individuals and local councils to deal with rents, disrepair, below-standard conditions, house purchase finance—indeed, the whole picture. Hence, this is an admirable guide for the non-specialist. Principal feature is the writer's demonstration of the need for a minimum programme of 500,000 houses and flats a year for as many years ahead as it may take to wipe out the 'heartbreak'.

Second to this is an exposure of the 1964 Housing Act's failure to speed-up elementary improvements to older houses not yet structurally unsound. These form a substantial proportion of the 3 million homes we have still deprived of essential amenities.

New housing and improvements to sub-standard existing housing provided soon (i.e. not in Wonderland) would require every year much more finance than now made available. Frank Allaun is not daunted by this. Repeatedly he points to the unproductive expenditure on 'defence' and shows what our choice is. His final chapter boldly expounds this theme and ably exposes the fatuity of wanting the housing question to be solved for this generation whilst acquiescing in arms expenditure of £2,300 m. a year. This unusual feature in any book on housing is characteristic of Allaun's always practical approach. It elevates his book from a run-of-the-mill, yet very able, introduction to the obstinate old Housing Question into a political programme.

I feel the book less satisfactory on questions of rent. On private landlords' rents Allaun shows how very unsatisfactorily Labour's 1965 Rent Act is working, but he puts forward no radical proposals. On council rents, his discussion of various elements of the problems faced by councils and their tenants is well done. But he offers no line of conclusive reform in housing finance such as would end the growing crisis causing such 'heartbreak'—and deprivation and indignation, too. An essential preliminary to further expansion of our stock of council housing is solution of the rents problem through a wholesale reform of the present financial arrangements and commitments, described not so long ago by Harold Wilson as 'a shambles' (but in no wise changed since the verdict was uttered!) Failure to do this will prolong and intensify the 'heartbreak'.

TOM VERNON

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Money and Inflation
Emile Burns
Lawrence & Wishart, 64 pp; 5s.

ONCE AGAIN EMILE BURNS has produced a remarkably clear and concise explanation of a complex subject. Today when every economic issue is coloured and distorted by such factors as the changing value of money, balance of payments crises, or Britain's role as an international banker, this book will be of particular value.

The first chapter explains from the standpoint of Marxist theory the concepts of value and price and their relationship to gold—'on' and 'off' the gold standard. The second chapter explains how the actual quantity of money available for use as 'purchasing power' depends not only on incomes paid out but also on money made available through the banks and the financial system as a whole for use as capital. After a chapter on monopoly pricing policy which includes a number of illustrations of how this leads to constant price raising, and a chapter dealing with the impact of Government spending and taxation on prices, the book concludes by tackling 'the basic causes of inflation'. This section, in my view, leaves room for argument. 'The origin,' writes Emile Burns, 'and the continuation of the price rises have been due to two principal causes—the influence of the monopolies striving to increase their profits, and the action of governments in raising the cost of living through increasing indirect taxation and other measures'. From this very generalised statement of a cause Emile Burns does not succeed, I think, in indicating what kind of remedial policies our economy requires. In this connection it might have been useful to deal with international financial relationships, balance of payments problems, etc. from a somewhat different point of view; in particular, to say more about import and exchange controls in relation to internal economic and monetary policy. This aspect of things is crucial in working out alternative policies with which to combat those of the monopolies. Emile Burns quotes the Italian Marxist Grano in support of his view that the postwar inflation is a policy carried out by the monopolies; but, in my view, Emile Burns does not sufficiently emphasise that it is the outcome of a struggle with alternative policies. 'The contradiction between capital and labour', writes Grano, 'between profit and wages is expressed in this clash between two opposed economic policies, between two alternative criteria for the division of the national income.' (*Critica Marxista*, May/June 1964, p. 37.) The current problem of inflation is therefore a more complex one than the concluding pages of this book suggest. However, as a starting point for clear thinking about the realities that lie behind the mystification of money it is to be strongly recommended. JOHN EATON

SOVIET AWARD FOR MR. JACK LINDSAY

Mr. Jack Lindsay, a frequent contributor to the Arts section of *LM*, last month received the Badge of Honour award from the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet for his translations of Soviet prose and poetry. Readers will wish to join with us in extending to Mr. Lindsay our heartiest congratulations on this well-deserved honour.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ACCENT ON PEACE

FROM conferences and demonstrations to massive student protests, the accent is loud and clear on ending the American war in Vietnam. So strong is this feeling that no member of the Government has been able to face the public without being made uncomfortably aware of it.

The Easter marches this year must unite all who are opposed to this brutal war, whatever their differences on other questions, making a show of strength that represents a force to be reckoned with.

Many of our readers reflect this feeling. 'Now is the time to stand together with all who are sickened by this war', says a letter from Wales, 'and because I want to see *LM* play its usual part in uniting all shades of progressive opinion, here's a pound towards that end'.

A Grantham reader, choked with anger at current events, writes: 'sometimes I get so damn mad that the only curative therapy is to send a few bob to you'. This kind of medicine helps us, too!

Several of our regular donors have been affected by recent economic purges, and factory closures in certain areas have lowered industrial sales. It is particularly urgent just now that both circulation and cash should keep pace with the rising momentum of the movement, where *LM* has such a vital responsibility in uniting peace-lovers everywhere.

Great numbers of our readers will be on the march this Easter—if each one sold an extra *LM* to fellow-demonstrators they would not only be potentially doubling our circulation, but strengthening the whole purpose of the march. **Helen Falber.**

£94 17s. 1d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: Two Tynesiders, 5s; C.M.T., £5; H.L. (USA), £5 16s 8d; N. Usher, 5s; S. Yudkin, £1; A. Allan, £5; M. Philibert, 5s; Southend Branch, 15s; M. Bell, £1; J. Rink, 5s; Les Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 3s; Oldham Branch, 2s; S. Mill, £1; John and Jenny Pinkerton, 5s; E. Strachen-Rogers, £1 1s; T. Crichton, £3; G.I., 2s 6d; D. H. Strathern, 13s; Highgate Reader, £6; L'Humanite, 5s; L. Hadfield, 15s; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; D. Strathern and Friends, 10s; E. Sheldon, £1; A. Corbett, £1; Oliver Twist and friends, 15s; R. McLeod, £1; S. Morrissy, 10s; R. Paul, 10s; Kitty Millward and friends, 15s; Bob Stewart, £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; 'Socialist Sailor', £2; A.M.T. (for Fernando and Guilherme), 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: C. M. Searle, 3s; A. Collindridge, 3s; S. Beer, £1; W. Green, 13s; 'Anon', £1; S. Rodriguez, 3s; J. Brookes, 3s; F. Wignall, 3s; N. MacDonald, £1 3s; S. N. Dyal, 3s; T. Foran, 13s; E.B. (Canada), 4s 6d; A. Beak, 10s; L. Gallop, 8s; J. Wood, 11s; 'Sympathiser', £3 7s 6d; S. (USA), £2 12s 1d; L.H. (USA), £8 6s; S. and H.R. (USA), £8 14s 7d; E.V.B. (USA), £2 17s 2d; M.H. (Canada), £1 12s 11d; D. M. Grove, £1; J. I. Isherwood, £1; W. G. Garvey, 3s; P. Lewis, 3s; W.C. (Australia), £2; F. Binks, 3s; W.S.W. (Canada), 7s 6d; J. Adam, 6s 6d; R. A. Ward, 5s; C. R. and S. Grant, 4s 6d; W.V.S. (Canada), 10s; 'Anon', Edgware, 10s 6d; A. Burgon, 7s 6d; F. H. Bird, £3 13s; A. Hanrahan, 18s 1d; D.T. (USA), £1 11s 10d; D.B. (USA), 6s 4d; R.A. (USA), 6s 4d; K.W.R. (USA), £2 16s 1d.

Our thanks to you all,
Co-op No. L99482

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
01-346 5135

Published by The Trinity Trust, distributed by Unity Publications (Finchley), Ltd., and printed by London Caledonian Press Ltd. (T.U.), Watford, Herts.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PAMPHLETS

Still a few copies available of:

NEO-NAZIS
by D. N. Pritt 2s 6d

U.S. CHEMICAL WARFARE
by Prof. E. H. S. Burhop 6d

INDIA IN TRAVAIL
by R. Palme Dutt 1s 0d

WHITHER CHINA?
by R. Palme Dutt 2s 6d

Order from:
134 Ballards Lane, London N.3 or
CENTRAL BOOKS
37 Gray's Inn Road, W.C.1

LABOUR RESEARCH

REDUNDANCY PAY AND THE COURTS
RISING COST OF ARMS
MORE AND MORE MERGERS

1s. 6d.—or 1s. 9d. by post

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
78 Blackfriars Road, London, S.E.1

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.

THE COUNTRY STANDARD
Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- post free or send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27 Bedford St., Strand, London, W.C.2

MIMETTE FURS LTD.
Wide range of furs, coats, stoles and capes.
117 High Street, Croydon, Surrey
'Phone CROydon 4328

CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

(4s. a line, minimum 12s. Cash with order to: 'Class. Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

WE BUY BOOKS, pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: 01-876 7254. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Liffords Pl., S.W.13.

STAMPS: USSR our speciality. New issue service and on 7 days' approval. Other countries available, including Commonwealth. State interests and send 4d. to Grant, Westerly, Templecombe, Somerset.

Labour Monthly

Bound Volume for 1967

A history of the year's events!

A permanent record

A 'must' for every labour movement Library

ORDERS BEING TAKEN NOW!

Through your usual newsagent, price £1 10s 0d, or send 10s 6d plus 2s packing and postage and your loose copies as soon as possible to:

Unity Publications (Finchley) Ltd.
134b Ballards Lane, London, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CIRCULATION BOOSTER

Please send a free specimen copy to:

(1) Name.....

Address.....

(2) Name.....

Address.....

You may mention my name (or) I enclose note to be sent on.

(Signed).....

(Address) .....

.....

To the MANAGING EDITOR, LABOUR MONTHLY
134 BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

The African Communist

Quarterly Journal of the South African Communist Party

★

A well-informed and analytical survey of the unfolding African Revolution in the light of scientific socialism.

★

Single copy: 2s. 6d.

Annual Subscription: 10s. (U.K. and Europe); 4s. (Africa); $1.50 (America); Airmail £3.

25 per cent reduction to students on surface mail subscriptions.

★

London Distributor:

ELLIS BOWLES
52 PALMERSTON ROAD
LONDON, S.W.14

WHY NOT BY POST?

It's quicker — and it's cheaper too!

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

I enclose 27s. (Overseas, 30s., Canada and USA, $4.50), for year's subscription from the

..... issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY

134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED